

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 4-6 and 14-17 are pending in this application, with Claims 4, 14 and 17 being independent.

Claims 4, 14, and 17 have been amended. Applicant submits that support for the amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least, for example, at page 3, lines 3-6 and 13-15. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Claims 4, 14, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

Applicant submits that the rejection is moot since the claims have been amended to omit the language to which the Examiner objected. Nevertheless, to make clear that Applicant does not concede the propriety of the rejection, the following comments are provided.

The Examiner objected to the claim feature of analyzing a command of the print control data without using a common key. The Examiner asserted that this contradicted the description of the invention in the original specification. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the original specification described extracting encrypted print image data by analyzing a command of the print control data using a common key. Applicant respectfully submits that the portions of the original specification do not say what he asserts they say. For example, page 4, lines 20-25 merely describe encrypting print control data using a common key. Nothing is said about analyzing a command of print control data with or without a common key. Further, page 7, lines 17-27 merely describe that a common key is obtained in step S1014 and then, in a separate step, the command of the print control data

is analyzed and encrypted print image data is extracted in step S1015. The specification goes on to say that in step S1016 the print image data is decrypted using the common key obtained in step S1014. Thus, steps S1014 and S1016 refer to the common key, but step S1015 of analyzing the command of the print control data does not refer to the common key. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the original specification does not contradict the prior version of Claim 4. In particular, the Examiner is requested to note the distinction between analyzing and extracting encrypted data as opposed to actually decrypting the encrypted data. While decryption may require the use of a key, analyzing and extracting such data does not.

Claims 4-6 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,677 (Wiegley) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097323 (Laptsun et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

As recited in independent Claim 4, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of extracting encrypted print image data by analyzing a command of the print control data into which the encrypted print image data has been converted as a command, and decrypting the encrypted print image data extracted by the analyzing. With this feature, the encrypted image data that has been converted to the form of a print control command can be handled in the form of a print control command, and the encrypted image data is extracted by analyzing a command of the print control data. Applicant submits that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of Claim 4.

The Examiner contends that Fig. 5B of Wiegley discloses the claimed analyzing means. However, that figure shows analyzing whether or not a session identifier and a

session key are valid, using a hash value. However, that patent fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of extracting encrypted print image data by analyzing a command of the print control data into which the encrypted print image data has been converted as a command.

Lapstun also fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned feature and therefore fails to remedy the deficiencies of Wiegley.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the present invention recited in independent Claim 4 is patentable over the cited art. Independent Claims 14 and 17 include similar features to that discussed above and are believed patentable for reasons similar to Claim 4. The dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the claims are now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Brian L. Klock
Registration No.36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200